
C O M M U N I T Y

D E V E L O P M E N T

M E M O

L O N G R A N G E P L A N N I N G

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
DATE: November 29, 1999
SUBJECT: Summary Notes – Steering Committee Meeting —
November 8, 1999

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

City of Battle Ground	John Idsinga, Council Member (representing , Mayor)
City of Camas	Lloyd Halverson, City Manager (representing Dean Dossett, Mayor)
Clark County	Judie Stanton, Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Clark County	Betty Sue Morris, Board of County Commissioners
Clark County	Craig Pridemore, Board of County Commissioners
City of Vancouver	Jack Burkman, Council Member (representing Royce Pollard, Mayor)
City of Washougal	Monty Anderson, Planning Director (representing Mayor).

Public:

Steve Dearborn, Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Eric Hovee, E.D. Hovee & Company

Staff:

C-TRAN - Todd Hemingson

City of Battle Ground - Eric Holmes, Planning Director

City of Camas - Marty Snell, Planning Director

Clark County:

Jose Alvarez, Planning Intern, Long Range Planning

Bill Barron, County Administrator

Ron Bergman, Public Works Director

Rich Carson, Director, Community Development

Evan Dust, Senior Transportation Planner, Long Range Planning

Lianne Forney, Public Outreach and Information Office Director

Nancy Gordon, Public Outreach and Information Specialist

Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Planning Manager, Community Development

Marlia Jenkins, Community Development

Mary Keltz, Board Office

Patrick Lee, Long Range Planning Manager, Community Development

Rich Lowry, Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner, Long Range Planning

Troy Rayburn, Board Office

Phil Wuest, Travel Model Analyst, Long Range Planning

City of Vancouver

Azam Babar, Long Range Planning Manager

Pat McDonnell, Assistant City Manager

Bryan Snodgrass, Planner, Long Rang Planning

Introductions / Roll Call

Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

Legal Framework / Background

Rich Lowry outlined the roles and responsibilities of the Steering Committee. Lowry distributed 4 documents to the Steering Committee that he felt represented the essential legal instruments relating to plan review.

1. Growth Management Act – Section 130
Two provisions – one requiring review at least every 5 years and another requiring Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) review once every 10 years.
2. Growth Management Act — Section 120
This section requires the establishment of county-wide planning policies with the goal of fostering cooperative planning on ordinances and policies that would affect adjacent jurisdictions.
3. Growth Management Act — Section 215
It imposes upon counties a 5 year plan monitoring requirement to be completed by 2002. It requires counties to take reasonable measures, excluding UGB adjustment, to address findings of a county that conclude the plan is not meeting the densities or policies as expected.
4. County-wide Planning Policies also established an annual monitoring requirement for the county plan; in particular, item number 6 of those policies contemplated a 5-year review of the plan.
5. County Procedural Ordinance
There are sections of the county procedural ordinance that govern this review process. The procedural ordinance first established that the UGB would not be moved unless 75 percent of vacant commercial or residential land or 50 percent of industrial land was absorbed.

Lowry concluded his remarks with a discussion of the history of the role of the Steering Committee. He noted that historically it has been a tool to resolve issues between jurisdictions that arise in the planning process. The operation of the body has been informal in nature with no formal votes taken on any issue. The body itself has no formal decision-making status.

Lowry described the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as the technical staff for the review process. The TAC would be providing the draft agenda for the Steering Committee meetings.

Draft Plan Review Process

Patrick Lee presented a flow chart of the process and highlighted three major areas. The first of many milestones was the distribution of the draft plan monitoring report. The report will not be finalized until Spring 2000 to allow 1999 data to be added. The second major effort would be preparation of a baseline capital facilities plan (CFP) analysis. The primary CFP concern, for the county, is transportation but the sewer and water utilities are also of concern. The 3rd major area of initial work involves visioning. The TAC had major questions about “how broad” the visioning effort would be.

With the three major initial work areas concluded in the Spring, a population and employment projection estimate and allocation methodology would be developed so that a forecast could be made. With the CFP analysis and final Plan Monitoring report to set the framework, policy decisions could be made by the Steering Committee so that the future growth could be allocated to UGA’s and the rural area. With the growth allocations completed, the demand for capital facilities could be tested which may lead to another round of allocation and policy decisions. Once final decisions are reached, plan changes can be drafted to accommodate the forecast growth and the reviewed plan could be submitted for the approval process.

The draft process projects completion by December 2001.

Discussion Point No. 1 – How broad should the visioning effort be? Is it a simple revisiting of the framework plan and confirming that it still represents the vision for the community?

ACTION:

Committee Members Read Chapter One (Framework Plan) of County Comprehensive Plan

Response/Decision – The steering committee should read the Framework Plan. The sentiment expressed was that the vision process was more of a “fine-tuning” and an opportunity to address changes within cities, urban areas and rural areas rather than creating a new vision. One city concurred that their vision was changing. Others had concerns about the assumptions in the plan and the visioning process would be an opportunity to review them. The TAC is looking to the steering committee for guidance.

Discussion Point No. 2 – Does the proposed review timeline reflect sufficient time for the proposed Steering Committee, Planning Commissions, City Councils, and Board of Commissioners adoption procedure?

Response/Decision – Plan adoption will happen at the end of the process which the Steering Committee has yet to approve. That process will govern the actual timeline.

Governing Bodies Procedures

Patrick Lee introduced the review draft of the “governing bodies procedures” document. The document is meant to describe how three committees interact during the process:

1. Steering Committee gives policy direction to the Technical Advisory Committee (staff).
2. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is a staff committee consisting of the Planning Directors and Managers of the cities and county as well as lead capital facilities planning staff from C-Tran and RTC. Other service providers are to be engaged when addressing their specific capital facilities.
3. A Task Force is proposed which would be directed by the Steering Committee. Alternatively it could be called a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). County staff is proposing the Task Force be nominated by the Steering Committee and approved by the county commissioners. The county commissioners would set their charge and role in the process. The Task Force is also proposed to be a focal point for public discussion. It is hoped that the Task Force would operate in a consensus mode rather than be majority vote.

The process assumes that any differences between county and city adoptions would be worked out at the Steering Committee prior to final adoption by the county. C-TRAN and RTC are proposed additions to the list of agencies on the TAC.

Discussion Point No. 3 - Does the Steering Committee want a Task Force or do they want to be more active and deal with all the issues directly? What was the process, previously? Has the TAC evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of having a task force?

Response/Decision -

The previous process included many single-issue task forces/interest groups. Some members felt the task force would provide an opportunity to raise public awareness others felt there was sufficient representation through the Planning Commission, Steering Committee, City Councils and Board. Others felt the Task Force should have broad representation and serve as a vehicle for public involvement. Recognizing the potential for divisiveness, a suggestion was made that the key to a successful task force is selecting members and a clear charge. The TAC did not explicitly discuss the task force but could put together a summary memo for the committee.

ACTION:

Staff	Next meeting	Summary memo on advantages and disadvantages of Task Force approach
--------------	---------------------	--

Discussion Point No. 4 – Semantic Issues

Response/Decision – Two suggestions were made: the title of document be changed since the steering committee is the only governing body, and dropping the 5-year label to read “Plan Review” or “Review”. In order to show the representative nature of the Steering Committee the organization chart needs to show the Board of Commissioners and the City Councils above the Steering Committee. It was concluded the document needed some work and a clear draft would be sent to Steering Committee for review.

Discussion Point No. 5 –Distinction between Steering Committee and TAC.

Response/Decision – It was felt that there needs to be a clear distinction between Steering Committee and TAC due to the representative nature of the Steering Committee. It was suggested that the Steering Committee be involved in issues that involve jurisdictions other than the county and that the Steering Committee’s role is to provide policy direction. A request was made for a clear distinction between Steering Committee, TAC and the Task Force.

ACTION:

Staff	Next meeting	Send out clean draft of the procedure document reflecting the Steering Committee discussion
--------------	---------------------	--

Monitoring Report

Rich Carson presented a brief overview of the report to the committee and a 4-page “Executive Summary”. Rich noted the draft would be final the Spring of 2000 and would include 1999 data. He indicated that an area of concern was that Clark County has 51% of the rural residential land (lots of ≤ 5 acres) in the four-county bi-state metropolitan area with an existing capacity of 13,572 lots or 35,000 people. The urban versus rural development has remained

within the Plan forecast. The estimate of the 2012 build-out remains 81% urban and 19% rural. Land is being absorbed faster than projected but is still within the 75% (Residential) and 50% (Industrial) absorption thresholds. The preliminary finding is that the plan is performing as envisioned.

Discussion Point No. 6 - The multi-family versus single-family residential unit split. Steering Committee issue?

Response/Discussion – Staff responded that the plan contains a 60:40 single family:multi-family unit split and it appears that all of the urban centers are not meeting this target with the exception of Vancouver which is approaching the target (64%:36%). It was suggested the single-family/multi-family issue should be discussed as a Steering Committee issue. Some smaller cities suggested it was an issue for the Hearings Board.

Discussion Point No. 7 - Density

Response/Discussion – It was noted that single family development was falling short of the projected 6 units per acre, while multi-family was matching the 16 unit per acre assumption. The 6 unit per acre assumption includes a 40% infrastructure set-aside. A table will be added to the report to give a breakdown of each UGA.

Discussion Point No. 8 – Comments sent to Steering Committee or TAC?

Response/Discussion – Comments should be directed to the TAC and staff would prepare a memo back to the Steering Committee with proposed changes to the draft and asking for direction on those changes. A closing date for receiving comments would be established and would take the holidays into account.

ACTION:

Staff

Send out letter to cities requesting designated representatives (including alternates) and best time to meet.

Scheduling of Future Steering Committee Meeting

A letter will be sent out to the cities requesting both the designated representatives (regular and alternate) and suggested best time to meet. Suggestion was made to have evening meetings to encourage citizen involvement. Staff was asked to encourage the full participation of all of the cities. Future agenda topics will include a standing item from the TAC, City plan review schedules and work programs and any critiques of the plan monitoring report would be summarized for the Steering Committee.

\\county7\hbwg\long range planning\projects\cpt 99-003 steering committee\meeting minutes\steering committee - nov 8 1999 .doc